

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 11 of 20

-- REMARKS --

Specification. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Elahee objected to the specification as being unclear as to the difference between the "in-coming rings" and "system rings". The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection to the specification, because the terms "in-coming rings" and "system rings" as well as other similar terms are clearly illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 with the ordinary and customary meanings attributed to them by those of ordinary skill in the art.

First, the term "in-coming rings" as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 encompasses rings for routing a voice call from a business phone 10 to a wireless network 20 or a wireless network 20', respectively.

Second, the term "system rings" as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 encompasses rings for routing the voice call from wireless network 20 or wireless network 20', respectively, to mobile phone 30.

Third, the term "call forward rings" as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 encompasses rings for routing the voice call from wireless network 20 or wireless network 20', respectively, to vehicle phone 40.

Fourth, the term "fake rings" as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 encompasses rings that are generated by vehicle phone 40 to indicate a voice call subsequent to an answering of the "call forwarding rings" by vehicle phone 40.

Fifth, the term "ring back tones" as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 3 encompasses rings transmitted from vehicle phone 40 to wireless network 20 or wireless network 20', respectively, to indicate an answering of the "call forward rings" by vehicle phone 40.

Sixth, the term "ring backs" as illustrated in FIG. 1 encompasses rings transmitted from wireless network 20 to business phone 10 to indicate a reception of "ring back tones" by wireless network 20.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 12 of 20

Finally, the term "announcements/music/advertisements" as illustrated in FIG. 3 encompasses audio transmitted from wireless network 20' to business phone 10 to indicate a reception of "ring back tones" by wireless network 20'.

Withdrawal of the objection of the specification is therefore respectfully requested.

Drawings. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Elahee objected to the drawings because Examiner Elahee believed the terms "IN-COMING RINGS", "CALL FORWARDING RINGS" appeared to be the terms "IN-COMING CALL" and "CALL FORWARD CALL". The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection to this drawings, because all of the terms related to rings in that drawings are illustrated as rings and not as calls. Thus, these terms are exactly what they purport to be and not what they intend to indicate. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Elahee objected to and rejected pending claims 1-19 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each objection and rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 C.F.R. §1.112:

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 13 of 20

- A. Examiner Elahee rejected pending claims 1, 7-9 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the term "call state" as known in the art facilitates a routing of a voice call between various nodes in a telecommunication system, and the term "fake rings" as known in the art are generated by a device to indicate a voice call subsequent to an answering of call forwarding ring(s) by the device. The Applicant has therefore amended claims 1, 7-9 and 15-19 in view of the well known definition for the terms "call state" and "fake rings".

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 7-9, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, §2 as being indefinite is therefore respectfully requested.

- B. Examiner Elahee rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*")

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Elahee's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 over *FIGS. 1-3*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *FIGS. 1-3*. To warrant this obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18, all the claim limitations recited in claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 must be taught or suggested by the combination of *FIGS. 1-3*, and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in *FIGS. 1-3* or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify *FIGS. 1-3* to render claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18. See, MPEP §2143. The Applicant respectfully traverses this obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18, because *FIGS. 1-3* unequivocally fails to teach and suggest, and teaches away from each limitation of claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18:

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 14 of 20

Specifically, the operating principle of *FIGS. 1-3* is to terminate, not maintain, a call state of a voice call once a telematic device (e.g., vehicle phone 40) has answered call forwarding rings related to a voice call. Thus, Examiner Elahee's assertion that it would have been obvious at the time of the present invention to program a destination number into a switch to further route the voice call after the telematic device has answered the call forwarding rings can not be accomplished in view of the fact that the call state of the voice call is terminated after the telematic device has answered the call forwarding rings as taught by *FIGS. 1-3*. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify *FIGS. 1-3* to maintain the call state after the telematic device has answered the call forwarding rings, because to do so would change the principle operation of *FIGS. 1-3* in violation of the legal principle of obviousness.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* is therefore respectfully requested.

- C. Examiner Elahee rejected claims 3, 8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,695 to *Chakravarti et al.*

The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 8 and 19 are allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Chakravarti* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Chakravarti* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 15 of 20

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 3 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 3 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Chakravarti* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Chakravarti* is therefore respectfully requested.

- D. Examiner Elahee rejected claims 4, 9, 10, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,854 to *Roberts et al.*

The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 9 and 15 are allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 4 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 4 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 16 of 20

Claims 10 and 12 depend from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claims 10 and 12 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 10 and 12 are allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* is therefore respectfully requested.

- E. Examiner Elahee rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,375,161 to *Fuller et al.*

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 5 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 5 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Fuller* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Fuller* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 17 of 20

- F. Examiner Elahee rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,442 to *Goldman et al.*

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 6 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 6 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Goldman* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Goldman* is therefore respectfully requested.

- G. Examiner Elahee rejected claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,854 to *Roberts et al.* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,695 to *Chakravarti et al.*

The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Chakravarti* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3*. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Chakravarti* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 18 of 20

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 11 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 11 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Chakravarti* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Chakravarti*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Chakravarti* is therefore respectfully requested.

H. Examiner Elahee rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,854 to *Roberts et al.* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,375,161 to *Fuller et al.*

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 13 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 13 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Fuller* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Fuller* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 19 of 20

- I. Examiner Elahee rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("*FIGS. 1-3*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,854 to *Roberts et al.* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,442 to *Goldman et al.*

Claim 14 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 14 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 14 is allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Goldman* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *FIGS. 1-3* in view of *Roberts* and in further view of *Goldman* is therefore respectfully requested.

October 12, 2004
Case No. GP-301932 (2760/39)
Serial No.: 10/001,941
Filed: November 30, 2001
Page 20 of 20

SUMMARY

Examiner Elahee's objection and indefiniteness rejection of claims 1, 7-9 and 15-19 have been obviated by the amendments herein of claims 1, 7-9 and 15-19. Examiner Elahee's obviousness rejections of claims 1-19 have been obviated by remarks herein supporting an allowance of pending claims 1-19 over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-19 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Elahee is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **October 12, 2004**

Respectfully submitted,
JASMIN JIJINA, *et al.*

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
General Motors Legal Staff
Mail Code 482-C23-B21
300 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
313/665-4714

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113



Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicant